

**MINUTES  
STATE PRESERVES ADVISORY BOARD  
NORTH IOWA AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
CHARLES CITY, IOWA  
JUNE 13, 1994**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Shirley Schermer, Chair  
Joel Hanes  
Robert Kindwall  
Martha Maxon  
Jonathan Steege  
Larry Wilson

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Diana Horton

**ADVISORS PRESENT**

Kathy Gourley

**ADVISORS ABSENT**

Dorothy Baringer  
Rebecca Conard  
Jean Prior  
Daryl Smith

**STAFF PRESENT**

Mike Carrier  
Daryl Howell  
John Pearson

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Schermer called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A brief discussion took place regarding biological preference for research proposals.

***Motion was made by Larry Wilson to approve the meeting minutes of March 7, 1994, as presented. Seconded by Martha Maxon. Motion carried unanimously.***

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The following changes and additions were made to the agenda:

- Change Item #8 (Report of the Research Committee) to Item #9
- 
- Add: - New Item #8 - Donna Schildberg presentation (related to Item #7)
- Add: - Item #10 - Archaeological Work at Hartley Fort
- Add: - Item #11 - Report on Hayden Prairie
- Add: - Item #12 - Vandalism at Turkey River Mounds
- Add: - Item #13 - Foray Update
- Add: - Item #14 - September Meeting

***Motion was made by Jonathan Steege to approve the agenda as amended. Seconded by Robert Kindwall. Motion carried unanimously.***

### **STRASSER WOODS STATE PRESERVE**

The cities of Des Moines and Pleasant Hill, the Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation, and the Four Mile Volunteer Committee request permission to construct a portion of the Four Mile Creek Greenway Trail across Strasser Woods State Preserve.

Gay Wilson, Four Mile Creek Trail Committee, presented a history of the trail project and how it has grown since it's beginning in 1990. She related that this is the only trail on the east side of Des Moines and will link with several existing city and county parks, and Strasser Woods if approved by the Board. Ms. Wilson introduced Phil Poorman, City of Des Moines Planning Department.

Mr. Poorman stated that his department has worked with Gay Wilson and her group for the past four years. He noted that they recently received a \$265,000 grant from the IDOT Trails Grant Program to start this project. He related that there are six phases to the project which will connect trails from Ankeny to Yellow Banks county park. The cities of Des Moines and Pleasant Hill will initially contribute \$50,000 each to the project. Mr. Poorman stated that he is present today to ask that the Board grant permission to use a portion of Strasser Woods for the trail.

Lisa Hein, Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation, distributed copies of a map showing the proposed Four Mile Creek Greenway Trail. She pointed out the first

phase of the trail route beginning at Four Mile Community Center and going through the preserve, then eventually ending in Pleasant Hill. She gave a description of the area where the trail crosses 1300 feet of Strasser land. Ms. Hein noted that INHF helped to get Strasser Woods in the preserves system and they do not feel there would be any conflicts with the deed restrictions on the property. Some of the main restrictions are motorized vehicles (other than maintenance vehicles) and the removal of fossils, minerals, artifacts, plants and animals. She stated that the INHF contacted Joe Strasser and he was very comfortable with the location of the trail outside the fence line. Ms. Hein gave a slide presentation of the area.

Jonathan Steege asked about liability associated with the trail; maintenance of the trail; and how much disturbance to the preserve will take place when constructing the trail.

Ms. Hein stated that the trail will be owned by the cities of Des Moines and Pleasant Hill and they will be responsible for maintenance of the trails. She related that she cannot answer the question on liability and added that the impact to the preserve during construction should be minimal.

Mr. Poorman stated that when the contract is written with the developer it will include what should not be disturbed.

Discussion followed regarding restrictions for the area, whether it is contradictory to the articles of dedication, and the Board's obligations under 465C(11).

Director Wilson stated that the trail does not pose any conflicts with the purpose of the preserve or the articles of dedication, and as far as liability goes the state is self-insured. He noted that the east side of Des Moines is in need of trails and added that Gay Wilson took the initiative to involve a lot of players and has done a good job moving the project forward.

Martha Maxon stated that she merely wants to be sure the Board is following the law and read an excerpt from 465C(11). She made reference to a previous sewer easement issue at Strasser Woods.

Daryl Howell stated that the sewer easement was pre-existent to the preserve and the city decided to go around it.

Martha Maxon asked that Daryl Howell and John Pearson work with Mr. Poorman in developing the specifications for the contractor.

Discussion followed regarding the 12-foot width of the trail; the Four Mile Creek Recreation Center; the purpose for fencing along the preserve; and tying in an educational aspect with the trails.

Chairperson Schermer stated that she would like to see an archaeological and biological review of the area for unrecorded sites within the corridor where the preserve is located.

Discussion took place in regard to boundary signs and posting of rules for the preserve.

Gay Wilson indicated that rules are posted in the parking lot for the preserve.

Chairperson Schermer stated that she would like to see rules posted along the trail at the entrance to the preserve and also a sign noting where they are leaving the preserve.

***Motion was made by Larry Wilson to grant permission as requested to cross Strasser Woods State Preserve with the Four Mile Creek Greenway Trail, and for responsible parties to do the necessary biological and archaeological investigation of the preserve corridor, place appropriate signs to protect the interest of the preserve, and work with DNR staff on the project. Seconded by Jonathan Steege. Motion carried unanimously.***

Director Wilson stated that all contacts for the project should be made through Mike Carrier.

### **MALCHOW MOUNDS**

Daryl Howell reported that Bill Ohde, Wildlife Biologist, contacted Mr. Poisel about the possibility of purchasing the grazing rights for Malchow Mounds State Preserve. When Mr. Poisel donated the 11 acres for the preserve, he retained the right to graze the area. Purchase of the grazing rights would allow the department to have complete control of the preserve. Mr. Howell related that he tried to contact Mr. Poisel by phone but has not been able to reach him, so he has now written him a letter. He stated that he hopes to have more information for the Board at the September meeting.

Discussion took place in regard to management of the area and the possibility that closing it to grazing may increase brush problems.

### **REQUEST TO CONDUCT LAND SNAIL RESEARCH**

Daryl Howell stated that Tamara Ross, a graduate student at Iowa State University has requested permission to conduct land snail research at Bixby, Brush Creek Canyon, and White Pine Hollow preserves. He indicated that after consulting with USFWS and the Nature Conservancy, he selected cold air slopes

for this project that do not have listed species,. Mr. Howell noted that he will observe Ms. Ross' work methods this year and will then determine whether to allow other research next year.

***Motion was made by Jonathan Steege to grant Tamara Ross permission to conduct a study of land snails at Bixby, Brush Creek Canyon, and White Pine Hollow. Seconded by Martha Maxon. Motion carried unanimously.***

### **REQUEST TO CONDUCT ORCHID RESEARCH**

John Pearson stated that Doug Goldman, Botany graduate student at University of Texas, requests to search seven prairie preserves for Grass Pink, a Special Concern species of orchid which has been presumed extirpated in Iowa. Mr. Pearson noted that Mr. Goldman has the appropriate credentials as his immediate advisor is Dr. Robert Jansen, a specialist in plant and molecular systematics. Mr. Pearson advised that Grass Pink has not been seen in Iowa for over 50 years, and Mr. Goldman feels it may be that it is being overlooked. He related that if it is found Mr. Goldman would like to collect a few individuals to take back for analysis. Also, If it is found it would immediately have to be declared an endangered species.

Shirley Schermer asked if he finds a specimen whether he could collect it since it would be declared endangered.

Mr. Pearson noted that when this species is found there is usually a whole colony of it, and therefore a few individuals can be removed without harm to the plant. He related that Mr. Goldman will practice good botanical collecting ethics.

Discussion followed regarding how many plants should be found before Mr. Goldman is allowed to take a sample.

Jonathan Steege suggested that at least 20 plants be found in order for Mr. Goldman to collect a sample. No consensus was reached.

***Motion was made by Joel Hanes to grant Doug Goldman permission to conduct orchid research on prairie preserves as requested. Seconded by Robert Kindwall. Motion carried unanimously.***

Chairperson Schermer asked staff to remind Tamara Ross and Doug Goldman that a condition of being granted permission to conduct research is to supply a copy of their report to the Preserves Board.

## **INTERN ACTIVITIES**

John Pearson reported that John Hopp is an intern who has been compiling a bibliography of literature on state preserves and entering records in the database on rare plants and communities that occur on preserves. He distributed a list entitled "References to Research Done on State Preserves" as an example of some of the work that has been done by the intern

Daryl Howell noted that the intern's wages will be paid by the department through June, then the Board will provide \$2,000 from research funds.

Brief discussion followed.

## **STAFF ACTIVITIES**

John Pearson distributed a copy of activities he has done over the past three months and noted that 35% of his time has been Preserves Board related. A portion of his work activities related to the following areas: Brushy Creek (trail measurement); White Pine Hollow; Mt. Pisgah (brief visit-review area); Mt. Talbot (burn, cut trees, spray); Sheeder Prairie (burn); Kalsow Prairie (burn); Toolesboro Mounds (review area management); Liska-Stanek (brief visit-review area); Steele Prairie (brief visit-review area); Brush Creek Canyon (discuss management of Chimney Rock community; observed Yellow Ladys Slipper plant eaten by deer). Attended meetings on GIS mapping; attended meeting on proposed reopening of trails in NE part of Brushy Creek preserve; worked on analysis/report/display of trail issues; prepared IAS presentation; and coordinated research committee activities.

Daryl Howell distributed a copy of his preserves related activities from March to June 1994 as follows: presentation to IAS; presentation to Simpson College; Blue Spring area investigation; Malchow Mounds (grazing rights purchase); inspections of Brush Creek Canyon, Bixby, Mossy Glen, and Merritt Forest; research request for work on algific slopes on preserves; Old State Quarry (FEMA clean up and reseeding); Cold Water Cave (broken gate); Strasser Woods (review deed restrictions and easements); Waubonsie State Park (review archaeological report); Natural History Foray; and collection of slides for Preserve Slide Program. He related that 45% of his time was spent on preserves related work. Additionally, John Fleckenstein is spending about 5% of his time on preserves work.

Director Wilson commented that the department has come a long way since beginning the Natural Areas Inventory program in the early 80's. He related that at that time a sizable commitment was made to this program and staff has done a good job on the program.

Daryl Howell stated that working with the field staff makes the job much easier for himself as well as for John Pearson. Mr. Pearson noted that there are a number of man hours devoted to preserves work through the field personnel.

Joel Hanes stated that in going through the bi-ennial reports he has some concern about the legislature's commitment to the Preserves Board, adding that even though the number of preserves have increased over the years the funding in dollars has gone down.

Mike Carrier stated that in 1987 the Board and staff made a decision to begin melding the Board's budget request as part of the Division of Parks, Recreation and Preserves budget request. He noted that the only single item that shows up in the budget request that is preserves related is the \$27,600 in research funds.

Mr. Hanes reiterated that he does not think legislative appropriations are commensurate with the number of preserves and the work that needs to be done.

#### **BRUSHY CREEK PRESERVE TRAIL AND DONNA SCHILDBERG PRESENTATION**

In 1990, the Board approved the use of a trail through the Brushy Creek State Preserve contingent upon a concurrent study of impacts. In March 1993, this approval was extended one year to June 1994 in order to complete the study. Copies of the interim and final reports have been distributed to Board members. Development of trenches, churning of wet areas, illicit use of closed segments, and lack of evaluation standards were identified as problems. A decision on whether to approve continued use is needed.

Mr. Pearson reviewed the 1990 agreement to allow use of a trail through the preserve contingent upon a study being done at the same time. He noted that Dean Roosa, in April 1991, established 15 permanent stations at various points on the trails. Mr. Pearson related that he revisited the area in May 1994 and was able to locate 12 of the 15 stations. At that time he remeasured those and sent a corresponding report to the Board. The report covered study area and methods used, results, and discussion of same. In summary, the following four main points were made:

- The Brushy Creek Preserve trail exhibited a difference in profile anywhere from 1-3 inches in depth. The trail exhibits depths and rates of soil loss which appear modest compared to other, extreme sites. "Relative" comparison with extreme sites may not be a valid means of judging impacts. An "absolute" standard has not been articulated.
- Regardless of whether continued use of the trail is permitted, the trench on the spur ridge needs management attention to correct its erosive potential.

Numerous other sites within the Brushy Creek Recreation Area exhibit problems which equal or exceed those of the preserve trail in severity.

- Churning of wet soil on the flat upland was not avoided by rerouting the trail to the western border. The most recent rerouting to the eastern edge of the flat upland should reduce this problem significantly.
- Full compliance by equestrians with closure of the western border trail (and other closed segments) is needed.

Mr. Pearson displayed a map of the area and pointed out Stations 9 and 10 on the spur ridge noting that they had a gradual slope in 1991 and now have a trench 3-4 inches deep. He added that Stations 11 and 12 are anywhere from 6-12 inches deep.

Joel Hanes asked about the possibility of using a switchback in that area.

Mr. Pearson responded that people tend to ignore switchbacks and it has been found that there is poor compliance with them. He noted other problems in the wet soils area where the horse traffic has moved to a new route around either side, making it very wide and boggy. He pointed out the newest trail which was rerouted in October of last year to follow the break between the flat, wet soil and the steep, dry soil and indicated that it seems to be working out pretty well so far. He related that most users have been honoring the trail system but some have continued to use the Western border trail which has been closed for several months, and even the interior trail which has been closed for several years. He added that some riders have been riding along the construction zone fence and are using pieces of construction flagging, tying it to poles along the fence to indicate at what point they should turn into the woods.

Discussion followed regarding the needed trail work, and the long term impact of the new trail.

Donna Schildberg stated that the study has been going on for three years but the trails have been used for 20 years. She related that she rides them several times a year and, visually, you see very little that needs to be done, and there has been no trail maintenance done other than the maintenance done by the Brushy Creek Trails Advisory Board (BCTAB). She added that the BCTAB is who rerouted the trail through the preserve last fall. Ms. Schildberg noted that she was disappointed at the original 1991 placement of the preserve trail because it was going across an area that was always boggy in the spring. She added that after two years use she was ecstatic to learn that it was being rerouted out where the water could escape. She indicated that there was one wet place they noticed on Memorial Day weekend where the trail should be rerouted.

Mr. Pearson stated that the reason the reopened trail was avoided in 1991 was because when riders came upon a high point that overlooked the valley, people would use the very steep slopes to descend into the valley and have caused very



deep erosion. He noted that, in now using this trail, the ranger has made sure that the exits off the point ridges were very obviously closed and marked as such.

Donna Schildberg commented that the illegal use of trails is dwindling at a very reasonable rate. She related that the signing was terrible and people did not know when they were in the preserve. She stated that the BCTAB has worked very hard to do signing and it will take time to get people reprogrammed to the trails that have been closed and what is now being used. Ms. Schildberg indicated that the only illegal use was where the trail goes from the outside of the preserve to the preserve trail, about a 20 yard section. She added that it is a matter of educating people and proper signing.

Discussion followed regarding trenches on the trails, possibility of installing water bar system, sloping the trails to lean off-slope, and difficulty in getting a good study if trails are continually rerouted.

Mr. Pearson distributed copies of the Preserve Board minutes when the original request was made to allow equestrians use of the Brushy Creek preserve

Chairperson Schermer commented that her interpretation of the original action was that the Board would review the matter following a two year study and decide whether or not to continue to allow use of the trail through the preserves. Martha Maxon added that last year the Board extended the study for one year.

Donna Schildberg stated that she has information about some legislation pertaining to this issue. She presented a history of the Brushy Creek project since 1989 covering land acquisition, the formation of the Brushy Creek Trails Advisory Board, trail usage, and conflicts that occurred. She related that in 1992, the legislators in the Brushy Creek area reviewed the project and passed legislation to assist the BCTAB in finding areas for the placement of trails that would insure success for the equestrian aspect of the project. She read the following section of that legislation: "The Department, in cooperation with the Brushy Creek Recreational Trails Advisory Board, shall provide for trail improvement in the recreation area and the state preserve adjoining the recreation area. The Department shall establish and maintain a system of trails in the recreation area and the preserve. The trails should be established or maintained to insure the minimum possible disturbance to the natural terrain and the natural growth of the vegetation, including but not limited to trees. A system of trails shall include equestrian and pedestrian trails. The Department in conjunction with the Board shall provide for the location, type, and distance of trails consistent with this Section. The pedestrian trail shall be located in view of scenic attractions including the lake and the valley. The trail shall be established and maintained in areas where hunting is permitted. The Department and the Board shall plan for the development of the lakeshore."

Ms. Schildberg stated that the area of the preserve that this legislation was applied to is located on the east side of the preserve, in the new addition being asked for. She related that there is a group of small farm fields in that area where there is a trail system that would greatly benefit the project. She added that the BCTAB hopes that the Preserves Board, with the help of the legislation, will assist them in reopening the existing trails in this area and make the west side preserve trail a permanent equestrian trail. She noted that the Brushy Creek project was already in process when the preserve was declared. She added that Mike Carrier said there is a Code section that states a preserve cannot be declared that would interrupt the usage of the area in a project in process.

Mike Carrier clarified that he did not make that statement but there is a section in the Code that addresses existing use of preserves. He reviewed that last fall he pointed out that the recent legislation is significant encroachment on the authority of the Preserves Board, the Natural Resource Commission, and the Department, and to put such language in the Appropriations Bill is not good legislation.

Martha Maxon noted that she sent the Governor a letter of opposition to the bill on behalf of the Board.

Chairperson Schermer asked how it would work if the the Board votes not to allow trails through the preserve.

Mr. Carrier stated that each entity and each Board member should vote their own conscience and if a conflict occurs, then it would be best to ask advice from the Attorney General's Office. The question would be in regard to whose authority prevails in this situation. He added that it would be best to work out something that is mutually agreeable.

Discussion followed regarding various issues including impacts of establishing a new trail; continuing erosion damage; illegal trails use; and the need to educate people regarding proper trail usage.

Director Wilson stated that whether or not the legislation usurps the authority of the Board, he feels the Board has an obligation to maintain a connecting trail through the preserve (indicated by a red line on the map).

Discussion took place regarding where to locate/relocate trails; impacts to the trails; whether or not impact to the trails is severe; and proposed future trails.

Chairperson Schermer asked if the legislative mandate for a north/south connection could be met through the eastern section rather than the western section.

Director Wilson responded affirmatively but noted that the main equestrian area is going to be on the west side of the project.

Mike Carrier stated that he thinks a trail could be accommodated down the west side after construction of the dam.

Chairperson Schermer stated that if plans are to have one trail inside the preserve and one outside the preserve and to keep both of those trails open, she would argue for closing the one inside the preserve.

Mike Carrier stated that he would resist that argument because, from a day-to-day management standpoint, it is easier to keep the inside trail open and safe.

Discussion followed regarding the spur ridge trail.

Chairperson Schermer stated that she would like to see the impact in the whole area minimized. She related that if the impact can be minimized by going through the preserve and steps can be taken to control impacts she could accept that argument. She added that if there will be trails outside the preserve that parallel trails inside the preserve or that provide the north/south access by going outside the preserve, she would then question the need for the trails inside the preserve.

Mike Carrier commented that he feels the Board has an obligation to allow access through the preserve. He noted that the trail on the west is manageable and is one for which no practicable alternative exists. He agreed that if there are parallel trails inside and outside of the preserve it is not good sense to try to maintain both. His recommendation would be to close the one outside of the preserve where degradation is occurring.

Joel Hanes stated that the Board's job is to preserve the land and what it has to offer. He related that the Board wants to be accommodating but funding is needed to put in restrictive signs.

Discussion followed regarding enforcement, monitoring of the trails, and user education.

***Motion was made by Jonathan Steege to allow continued equestrian use of the existing designated trails at Brushy Creek State Preserve until such time it is determined that the use is detrimental to the uses set forth by the Board for the preserve, and that there be continued monitoring of the trails, appropriate signs installed, and trail maintenance as needed. Seconded by Robert Kindwall.***

Director Wilson stated that the department will make a commitment for adequate signage as well as for maintenance needs on the ridge identified by John Pearson as a potential problem area. He emphasized that the top priority

should be on maintenance of the trail system in the preserve. He added that the trail outside of the east boundary should be looked at and if there is concern with degradation, the Board may want to look at some alternative which could include closing it.

Jonathan Steege explained that there has been some soil loss impacts on the area which have been relatively minor and he is willing to allow usage on the trails that are already in existence, until such time there is continued off-trail usage that cannot be controlled. He related that some changes may need to be made at that point, but he does not feel there is enough evidence at this time to restrict usage of the trails.

***Vote on Jonathan Steege's motion carried unanimously.***

Director Wilson stated that he would like a copy of the map distributed by John Pearson to be part of the permanent official record, and to designate that the red line is the existing trail.

Chairperson Schermer pointed out an area on the map where Mr. Pearson noted that there was degradation and erosion occurring and asked that it be looked at in terms of possibly closing it down.

Mike Carrier stated that he feels it would be useful for the Board to meet near Brushy Creek to take a look at the area. He noted that Donna Schildberg also had another request today for opening some additional trails but she will probably wait until later for that request.

Further discussion took place regarding trail degradation.

Joel Hanes stated that the more trails and loops that are added to the preserves area, the more cutting across and the more degradation there will be. He added that he would be absolutely opposed to adding trails that parallel the direction of existing trails. He related that he does not see any reason to authorize loops within the preserve.

Chairperson Schermer and Martha Maxon wholeheartedly agreed with Mr. Hanes adding that there are many other areas where trails can be placed.

Donna Schildberg stated that the job of the BCTAB is to develop trails and there has been a question as to where trails can be located so they will be close to the campground. She stated that the BCTAB would like to invite the Preserves Board to meet with them, on site, to perhaps decide what can be done.

Chairperson Schermer stated that she feels the Board is making a major concession by allowing the north/south access along with the west/east

branches, and at this point does not think additional trails would be in the best interest or use of the preserve.

Consensus of the Board was to visit the area and walk the red line area shown on the map.

Robert Kindwall commented that the Board should thank the BCTAB because without them there would have been no maintenance on the trails; he expanded on the trail work they have done.

### **REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

Jonathan Steege reported that ten proposals for research funding were received and evaluated by the Committee. He noted that four proposals were biological issues and six were for archaeological issues. The Committee ranked proposals according to the numerical rating scheme devised in advance of solicitation in which points were awarded for merit, credentials, biological research, and targeting of pre-selected preserves. Cost was not an explicit factor at this stage of evaluation.

The ratings of each evaluator were standardized into 1 - 10 rank orders (adjusted for tie scores) and then compiled into the master rank order displayed as follows:

<u>Master Rank</u>	<u>Authors</u>	<u>Average Rank</u>	<u>Amount Requested</u>	<u>Cumulative Total</u>
1	Farrar and Raich	1.1	5351	5351
2	Danielson & Maloney	1.9	4760	10111
3	Anderson	4.4	7830	17941
4	Fleckenstein et al.	4.9	5000	22941
5	Stanley	5.6	10000	32941
6	Finney	6.5	7258	40199
7	Bettis	7.2	5005	45204
8	Loucks 3	7.6	5692	50896
9	Loucks 1	7.7	4834	55730
10	Loucks 2	8.1	5840	61570

Mr. Steege stated that the above ranking was sent to each Board member and that there is \$20,000 for funding. He added that the first three projects could be funded along with a portion of the butterfly study coordinated by John Fleckenstein.

Discussion followed regarding indirect costs; differences in ranking of specific proposals; the Fleckenstein proposal; the Anderson proposal and the possibility that he could use microfilm which may be available from Cultural Affairs.

Jonathan Steege stated that two issues are at hand, one deals with deciding which proposals should be funded and the other is whether the ranking system has addressed what the Board desires in the way of research proposals.

Chairperson Schermer asked if the committee members feel that the ranking system provided the proper level of discrimination in judging one proposal over another.

Mr. Steege stated that the priorities identified by the Board definitely have an impact on which projects get funded.

Mr. Pearson stated that all of the proposals had good intentions and good personnel but a majority of the committee wanted certain priorities.

Director Wilson stated that he expressed concern at the March meeting and will reiterate that projects should be scored on merit and not be given additional points for specific categories such as biological, archaeological, etc.

Following further discussion of the proposals, Chairperson Schermer stated that the question would be whether the Board agrees with the ranking of the four proposals as recommended by the Research Committee.

***Joel Hanes stated that he is happy with the ranking and moved that the Board approve research funds for the first four proposals as recommended by the Research Committee. Seconded by Martha Maxon. Motion carried unanimously.***

Futher discussion took place in regard to the ranking system.

### **REQUEST FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL TESTING AT HARTLEY FORT**

Chairperson Schermer stated that Fred Finney sent her a letter requesting permission to conduct test excavations at the Hartley Fort site. She noted that this is basically a follow up of what he had done last summer, and he is planning on doing some work outside the preserve but would like to extend the trench. He hopes to get some additional information from this work. She related that she would recommend approving the request provided that: 1) all excavated areas be backfilled at the conclusion of the field session; 2) the area be revisited by Mr. Finney in the spring of 1995 and if any of the backfilled areas have settled he will be responsible for refilling those areas; and 3) that he consult with John Pearson regarding revegetation of the disturbed areas and will follow John's recommendations.

***Motion was made by Martha Maxon to approve the request from Fred Finney to conduct test excavations at Hartley Fort with the three stipulations recommended by Chairperson Schermer. Seconded by Jonathan Steege. Motion carried unanimously.***

### **HAYDEN PRAIRIE REPORT**

Chairperson Schermer stated that the she received a letter from Carl Kurtz outlining his concerns and recommendations regarding some vegetation problems he had observed at Hayden Prairie. His letter expanded on issues pertaining to brush cutting, haying, and burning.

Jonathan Steege reported that last year he talked to Carl Kurtz and sent him a letter about the situation. He related that he compared some photos of the area taken by Mr. Kurtz along with some photos taken by a member of his own staff. He noted that his staff photos were taken in the late 1980's and show very little brushy encroachment. Mr. Steege added that the problem has escalated tremendously.

Joel Hanes commented that one management procedure per year is not going to do anything but cause the brush to spread out farther and farther. He noted that there are now huge groves of poplar which will soon shade out the prairie and it

will take a serious commitment to get the problem solved. He stated that he believes he could get volunteers to do the work to help alleviate the problems there.

John Pearson stated that the area is managed by the Highlandville Wildlife Area. He related that they had good intentions of doing brush cutting with a tractor-mower, but with all of the rain last year it could not be done due to concern over creating ruts in the soil. He added that brush cutting could be done along with a variety of other things, but it takes a lot of manpower, time, and equipment to do these things.

Chairperson Schermer commented that perhaps staff could work up a management plan and Joel Hanes organize some volunteers to help with the work.

Discussion followed regarding brush cutting; haying; applying chemicals; cutting and painting stumps; and possible burning.

Consensus of the committee was to have staff prepare a management plan and Joel Hanes provide volunteers to do the work.

### **VANDALISM AT TURKEY RIVER MOUNDS**

Chairperson Schermer reported that the park ranger from Pikes Peak State Park accompanied her to the Turkey River Mounds and pointed out five areas where it appeared someone had been digging. Four of the areas were at the SE end of a long narrow ridge and not in mounds (one of them was in a habitation site). She noted that the first mound she examined had a hole within an earlier disturbed portion of the mound. Also, there were recent petroglyphs which appeared that someone had formed with a tool or drill bit. A similar petroglyph appeared to have been there awhile and it was assumed that the same person carved them on the rock outcrops. Several areas had been burned, sporatically along the ridge. Chairperson Schermer indicated that the burned areas could have been caused from sparks from burned piles of flood debris. The digging and petroglyphs were the result of vandalism. She related that she and the park ranger are encouraging the sheriff's office and highway patrol to occasionally drive to the parking area and make note of vehicle license numbers there. Also, they are trying to get volunteers to hike up there once a week to show some presence in the area. She noted that the Turkey River Mounds area is still listed on the Iowa Highway Map and should be taken off the map.

### **FORAY UPDATE**



John Pearson reported that the Foray was held the weekend of June 3-5, and there were 13 attendees. He related that this was a record low number of attendance and since it was such a small number they went as a group. He pointed out that there was much more interaction than in the past and it was due to the small size of the group. He reviewed the areas they visited and some of the plants they located.

## **NEXT MEETING**

Chairperson Schermer stated that there is an area of the Loess Hills in Mills County which borders the Missouri River valley and contains a Nebraska phase earth lodge. She indicated that this area may be worthy of dedication as a preserve, and the Mills County Conservation Board is interested in exploring the possibility of dedicating all or a portion of the area as a preserve. She related that the Board could hold the September meeting in Mills County and visit Brushy Creek in the spring, or visa versa.

Bob Kindwall stated that it would probably be better to take the Brushy Creek trip in September because it would not be as wet as it would be in the spring.

Martha Maxon agreed with Mr. Kindwall noting that September would be a better time to walk the trails.

Director Wilson stated that he will not be available in September until the 20th, and that would move the meeting to the third Tuesday rather than the second Tuesday.

It was decided to hold the next Preserves Board meeting on Tuesday, September 20, beginning at 1:00 p.m., and to tour Brushy Creek on Wednesday, September 21. The Board also decided to invite the Brushy Creek Trails Advisory Board to participate in the September meeting and tour.

Prior to closing the meeting, Chairperson Schermer recognized Wayne Meyer, Director of Floyd County Conservation Board along with Marv Matthews and Ed Duroe, members of the board.

The Preserves Board decided that following dinner they would meet with the Floyd County Conservation Board members to brief them about the preserves system and answer any questions they might have about entering Rockford Quarry into the system.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

***Motion was made by Jonathan Steege to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Joel Hanes. Motion carried unanimously.***

With no further business to come before the State Preserves Advisory Board, Chairperson Schermer adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m., Monday, June 13, 1994

## **BOARD TOUR**

The Board was scheduled to tour the Rockford Quarry Fossil Area and Bird Hill State Preserve on Tuesday, June 14, 1994, beginning at 8:30 a.m. from Rockford City Park.